	Case 5:08-cv-05628-RMW Document 40 Filed 11/12/14 Page 1 of 4		
1			
2			
3	EÒËZÇŠÒÖÄÄFFBCBIE		
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	MADTIN D. DOVAL		
12	MARTIN D. ROYAL,  ) No. C 08-5628 RMW (PR)  ) Petitioner,  )		
13	) ORDER DENYING MOTION TO AMEND )		
14	M. MARTEL, Warden,		
15	Respondent.		
16	) ) )		
17			
18	On December 17, 2008, petitioner, a California prisoner proceeding <u>pro</u> <u>se</u> , filed a writ of		
19	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On October 5, 2010, the court denied petitioner's		
20	petition for writ of habeas corpus, and entered judgment in favor of the respondent. On April 13,		
21	2012, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal denied a certificate of appealability. On April 11, 2014,		
22	petitioner filed the instant motion to amend his petition.		
23	It is settled law in this circuit that one cannot use Rule 15 once an action has been		
24	dismissed and a final judgment entered unless the judgment is set aside under Federal Rules of		
25	Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). See Lindauer v. Rogers, 91 F.3d 1355, 1357 (9th Cir. 1996)		
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	("[O]nce judgment has been entered in a case, a motion to amend the complaint can only be		
28	entertained if the judgment is first reopened under a motion brought under Rule 59 or 60"). This rule applies equally to habeas petitions. <u>See Woodford v. Garceau</u> , 538 U.S. 202, 208 (2003)		
20	Order Denying Motion to Amend P:\PRO-SE\RMW\HC old\HC.08\Royal5628postjud.wpd		

("The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure apply in the context of habeas suits to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the Habeas Corpus Rules."). Re-opening a case is a high hurdle to overcome, as judgment is not properly reopened "absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law." Weeks v. Bayer, 246 F.3d 1231, 1236-37 (9th Cir. 2001).

Here, the court will not entertain a motion for relief from judgment, as petitioner has failed to demonstrate any of the grounds which might warrant such relief. Rather, he simply raises new claims of trial error, which would have been apparent to him at the time of his conviction. Thus, even if petitioner had filed a proper motion for relief from judgment, such relief would not be available.

Finally, construing this pleading as a new petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging the state court judgment under which petitioner is currently serving a prison sentence, the petition must be dismissed as successive under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A), because permission for filing has not been obtained from the court of appeal.

Petitioner's motion to amend is DENIED. No further filings will be accepted in this closed case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

Konald M. Luhyte
RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

1			
2			
3		<u>*E-FILED - 1/31/11*</u>	
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	MARTIN D. ROYAL,	No. C 08-5628 RMW (PR)	
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON	
13	V.	APPEAL	
14	M. MARTEL, Warden,		
15	Respondent.	(Docket No. 33)	
16		(Docket No. 33)	
17	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus		
18	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On October 5, 2010, the court denied the petition, entered		
19	judgment in favor of respondent, and declined to issue a certificate of appealability. Petitione		
20	has filed a notice of appeal and a motion to waive filing fees on appeal. The court construes		
21	plaintiff's motion as an application to proceed IFP on appeal.		
22	Because the court declined to issue a certificate of appealability in the order denying		
23	the petition, petitioner's request to proceed IFP on appeal (docket no. 32) is also DENIED.		
24	When the court declined to issue a certificate of appealability in the order denying the		
25	petition, it determined that there were no valid grounds for an appeal. Accordingly, granting		
26	the petitioner's application to proceed IFP on appeal would not be appropriate.		
27			
28	Order Denying Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis on Appeal P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.08\Royal628DenyIFP-Appeal.wpd		

Case 5:08-cv-05628-RMW Document 40 Filed 11/12/14 Page 3 of 4

## Case 5:08-cv-05628-RMW Document 40 Filed 11/12/14 Page 4 of 4

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

This order terminates docket no. 32.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 1/28/11



Order Denying Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis on Appeal P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.08\Royal628DenyIFP-Appeal.wpd